

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 were pending in the application. Claims 30-35 are allowed. Claims 3, 5, 22, and 24 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 4, 10, 17-20, 23, 30-35 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-2, 4, 6-21, 23, 25-35 are now pending in the application.

Claims 3-5 and 22-24 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Applicant appreciates Examiner's consideration of these claims.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 7-12, 14-21, 26-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams (U.S. Patent 5,953,742) in view of IEEE Dictionary – “parity check”.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the features of claim 3. Independent claim 10 has been amended to incorporate the features of claim 5. In addition, independent claim 17 has been amended to incorporate the features of claim 5. Furthermore, independent claim 20 has been amended to incorporate the features of claim 22. Applicant submits that each of the amended independent claims recites a combination of features deemed allowable by the Examiner. In accordance, amended independent claims 1, 10, 17, and 20 are believed to patentably distinguish over the cited references, whether alone or combined.

Claims 2 and 7-9 depend on claim 1, claims 11-12 and 14-16 depend on claim 10, claims 18 and 19 depend on claim 17, and claims 21 and 26-29 depend on claim 20, and are therefore believed to patentably distinguish over the cited references, whether alone or combined, for at least the reasons given above.

Additionally, Claims 6, 13, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of IEEE Dictionary – “parity check” as applied to claims 1, 10, and 20 above, and further in view of IEEE Dictionary – “word(6)”. Claim 6, claim 13, and claim 25 are dependent upon claim 1, claim 10, and claim 20, respectively, and are believed to patentably distinguish over Williams in view of IEEE Dictionary – “parity check” and further in view of IEEE Dictionary – “word(6)”, whether alone or combined, for at least the reasons given in the above paragraph discussing claims 1, 10, and 20.

Furthermore, independent claim 30 has been amended to incorporate the features of original claim 10 and claim 3. Also, independent claim 33 has been amended to incorporate the features of original claim 17 and claim 3. Applicant submits that each of the amended independent claims recites a combination of features deemed allowable by the Examiner. In accordance, amended independent claims 30 and 33 are believed to patentably distinguish over the cited references, whether alone or combined. Claim 31 depends on claim 30 and claim 34 depends on claim 33, and are therefore believed to patentably distinguish over the cited references, whether alone or combined, for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

If a phone interview would speed allowance of any pending claims, such is requested at the Examiner's convenience.

If any extensions of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) are necessary to prevent the above referenced application(s) from becoming abandoned, Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extensions. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5681-03000/BNK.

Respectfully submitted,



B. Noël Kivlin
Reg. No. 33,929
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT(S)

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8800
Date: 3-7-05